

REMARKS

Claims 3-16 and 18-23, and 25 are pending. Claim 24 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

I. **Claim Amendments/New Claim**

The present claims have been amended to recite that the glue is applied during manufacture of the boards, as is supported in the originally filed application, at, for example, claim 2. No new matter has been entered. As the subject matter added to the independent claims was presented in the last amendment in claim 24, Applicants respectfully present that this amendment does not raise any new issues requiring further consideration and/or search.

II. **Claim Objections**

Claim 7 stands objected to for informal matters. In response, claim 7 has been amended to correct any lack of antecedent basis.

III. **35 USC § 103**

Claims 3-7, 9-15 and 18-25 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nelson (U.S. Patent No. 5,618,602) in view of WO 96/27721. The Office Action asserts that Nelson teaches each feature of the claims, except for the guiding wedges comprising a plurality of guiding wedges arranged perpendicular to the joint as presently cited, for which purpose WO '721 is cited. However, in light of the amendments to the claims, and the remarks which follow, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Initially, despite the assertion of the Office Action, the snapping webs 9 of WO ‘721 are not arranged perpendicular to the joint, as recited by the present claims.¹ A review of Fig. 2 of WO ‘721 shows that snapping wedges 9 extend parallel to the extension of the joint, i.e., *not* perpendicular to the joint. In other words, as the joint shown in Fig. 2 of WO ‘721 extends “upwards and downwards from the tenon,” the snapping wedges 9, which also extend “upwards and downwards of the tenon,” cannot be perpendicular to the extension of the joint.

Additionally, the present claims have been amended to recite that the glue, used to join the boards together, is applied during manufacture, as was previously recited by claim 24. In rejecting previous claim 24, the Office Action states that Nelson “shows and discloses that glue 20 is applied during manufacturing of the guiding wedge 27, 30.” Although Nelson teaches that glue can be applied in the joint, there is no teaching or suggestion to supply the glue during manufacture of the boards, as presently claimed.

Thus, there are at least two deficiencies in the proposed combination of Nelson and WO ‘721, which cannot meet the limitations as presently claimed. Having failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the claimed invention, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

¹

Applicants note that the Office Action actually states “The applicant argues that the Martensson guiding wedges (9) are arranged parallel to rather than perpendicular to the *boards*” (emphasis added). However, this is a mischaracterization of both Applicants’ arguments and the present claims. The claims recite that the guiding wedges are perpendicular to the plane defined by the *extension of the joint*, not the boards.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all objections and rejections are overcome. Thus, entry of the above amendments and passage of the application to allowance are respectfully requested. If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


Thomas P. Pavelko
Registration No. 31,689

TPP/EPR/mat
Attorney Docket No.: TPP 30887CIP2

STEVENS, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.
1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 850
Washington, D.C. 20005-2477
Telephone: (202) 785-0100
Facsimile: (202) 408-5200 or (202) 408-5088

Date: February 21, 2006